

October 7, 2009

**Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room E3-262 Engineering and Information Technology Complex**

---

**Members Present**

Dr. D. Barnard, Chair  
Prof. S. Abeyssekera  
Ms. K. Adams  
Prof. S. Alward  
Prof. John Anderson  
Prof. T. Anna  
Prof. J. Bartlett  
Mr. A. Birjandi  
Ms. C. Bone  
Mr. D. Bowles  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Rector D. Bracken  
Prof. M. Campbell  
Ms. N. Chislett  
Dean D. Collins  
Prof. E. Comack  
Prof. K. Coombs  
Prof. R. Cossar  
Dr. G. Cronin  
Prof. I. Davidson-Hunt  
Dean E. Dawe  
Dean J. Doering  
Mr. T. Dueck  
Prof. M. Edwards  
Prof. J. Embree  
Dr. M. Enns  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Dean G. Feltham  
Dean H. Frankel  
Prof. A. Frederiksen  
Prof. M. Freund  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Rectrice R. Gagné  
Mrs. E. Goldie  
Ms. J. Guise  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. N. Hansen  
Prof. P. Hess  
Ms. K. Holden  
Dr. J. Hoskins  
Prof. P. Hultin

Dean A. Iacopino  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Prof. E. Judd  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Prof. S. Kouritzin  
Prof. K. MacKendrick  
Ms. K. Marcynuk  
Mrs. D. McCallum  
Mr. J. McGurran  
Dr. R. McIlwraith  
Prof. D. McMillan  
Prof. A. McNicol  
Prof. E. Milliken  
Dr. D. Morphy  
Mr. P. Nawrot  
Ms. D. Okrusko  
Mr. M. Ostadrahimi  
Prof. J. Owens  
Ms. M. Pauls  
Dean R. Perron  
Prof. S. Pistorius  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Mr. O. Qureski  
Mr. S. Rashid  
Mr. J. Roberts  
Dean D. Ruth  
Dean D. Sandham  
Prof. M. Scanlon  
Dean R. Sigurdson  
Prof. W. Simpson  
Dr. D. Smith  
Prof. T. Sullivan  
Dr. R. Tate  
Prof. C. Taylor  
Dean M. Trevan  
Mr. A. Vahedi  
Dr. van Ineveld  
Prof. J. Van Rees  
Prof. M. Vrontakis  
Dean L. Wallace  
Dean M. Whitmore  
Dean J. Wiens  
Dr. D. Wirtzfeld

Prof. E. Worobec  
Prof. A. Wright  
Prof. A. Young  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University Secretary  
Ms. M. Brolley,  
Recording Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Dr. C. Blais  
Mr. P. Dueck  
Dr. K. Grant  
Prof. N. Hunter  
Prof. K. Jensen  
Dr. R. Lobdell  
Mr. N. Marnoch  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Prof. C. Morrill  
Mr. P. Nawrot  
Dr. J. Ristock  
Mr. M. Tripple

**Regrets**

Prof. Judy Anderson  
Prof. J. Asadoorian  
Dean C. Axworthy  
Prof. T. G. Berry  
Prof. J. Blatz  
Prof. L. Coar  
Dr. E. Cowden  
Dean D. Crooks  
Dr. H. Dean  
Dean I. Diallo  
Prof. G. Hatch  
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum  
Dr. A. MacDiarmid  
Prof. J. Mactavish  
Mr. R. Mahé  
Ms. H. Milan  
Dr. W. Norrie  
Prof. M. Pritchard

Dean G. Sevenhuysen  
Prof. L. Simard  
Dr. L. Smith  
Prof. J. Trottier

**Absent**

Prof. W. Akinremi  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Prof. Y. Gong  
Ms. J. Horner  
Ms. K. Hurst  
Prof. J. Irvine  
Prof. S. Kirby  
Prof. D. Kuhn  
Mr. E. Kuz  
Mr. C. Martel  
Prof. P. Nickerson  
Mr. R. Pudavick  
Dr. I. Ripstein  
Ms. N. Sajan  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Dr. R. Soni  
Ms. K. Thompson  
Dean J. Watkinson

**Also Present**

Ms. S. Coyston  
Ms. S. Deane  
Ms. M. Emery  
Ms. S. Foster  
Ms. A. Gaboury  
Ms. R. Howard  
Ms. E. Kim  
L. Liu  
Ms. T. Lussier  
Ms. K. McQuarrie Smith  
Ms. S. Petz  
Ms. P. Robertson  
Mr. C. Stewart  
Mr. B. Wong

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Mary Brabston.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

Dean John Wiens, co-chair for the 2009 United Way Employee Campaign, introduced Dr. Jeff Zabudsky, President of Red River College and also the Chair of the 2009 Winnipeg United Way Campaign.

Dr. Zabudsky thanked Senate for the opportunity to speak to Senate. He indicated that he has been working quite heavily on the United Way campaign over the last number of months. He indicated that he had a fabulous cabinet team this year to help and is particularly honoured and pleased that David Barnard agreed to be a member of the United Way Winnipeg cabinet, a considerable commitment of time and energy.

The University of Manitoba, he noted, has been an integral part of making our community stronger and particularly has demonstrated leadership to the United Way manifested through the energy and dollars invested in the United Way. He noted that the faculty and staff of the University have a tradition of giving back to the community. He noted that last year alone, the Fort Garry and Bannatyne campuses contributed over \$447,000 to the United Way engaging over 200 volunteers in the process.

The focus today, Dr. Zabudsky indicated, is on leadership; that special type of giving by individuals who choose to step forward for \$100 per month, \$1200 per year to give to the United Way. With 117 leadership donors, the University of Manitoba is the number one organization in this city; the University is making a profound impact on this city.

The United Way has an impact on all of our lives because it is woven into the tapestry of our entire community. The United Way ensures that an essential network of services are available to people in our community. There are over 100 agencies who are supported by the work of United Way. Dr. Zabudsky mentioned the incredible work being done by agencies such as the Boys & Girls Club and CNIB who are supported by the United Way.

Dr. Zabudsky indicated that there are three major areas of focus for the United Way: young people, reducing poverty, and focusing on our neighbourhood. He asked Senate to consider leadership. He noted that the cabinet had spent a lot of time considering goals in light of the unpredictable economy and the goal chosen was actually one which will stretch ourselves as the campaign was launched a few weeks ago with an \$18.2 million target, which is larger than ever before.

Leadership at the United Way means many things, giving of one's time and resources. He noted that many in the room are already doing that and he thanked them for that but leadership also means making a personal contribution to the United Way and to the great work that they do. Every dollar of donation to United Way goes to delivering services; all administration costs of fundraising and the salaries that go with that are covered by a provincial grant.

Dr. Zabudsky noted that Winnipeg is known for its generosity and that the United Way met its goal last year in spite of the fact that we were side swiped by the financial crisis; many

communities across Canada did not achieve their goal, Winnipeg did. He noted that at times like these it is important that our community step up and he asked Senators to consider a gift of \$1200 or more and, if you were a leadership donor in previous years, he offered thanks and requested, respectfully, that you consider a stretch this year so that we can achieve our goal for our community. "It's time for us all to take action".

As mentioned, he said, there are over 200 volunteers at the University of Manitoba working with the United Way and he acknowledged Dr. John Wiens for his many years of support for the United Way, Marvin Kocay is also supporting the campaign this year, Dr. Emily Etcheverry and Roz Howard is taking on the role of chair of leadership so she is the one to see with any questions on this.

In closing he noted that this is a huge challenge but noted that this year the campaign was launched with the largest proportion of our dollars already raised at 39% it validates the total and demonstrates that the community has already stepped up.

**I        CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,  
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – OCTOBER 2009**

The Chair indicated that a copy of the list of graduands was available at the front table for examination by members of Senate.

**Professor Brabston MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, that the list of graduands provided to the University Secretary by the Registrar be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Registrar up to October 9, 2009.**

**CARRIED**

**II        REPORT ON MEDALS AND PRIZES  
TO BE AWARDED AT THE OCTOBER CONVOCATION**

The Chair noted that this report was available at the front table for examination by members of Senate.

**Professor Brabston MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee THAT: the report on medals and prizes provided to the University Secretary be approved by Senate.**

**CARRIED**

**III       MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION**

**1.        Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees**

In keeping with past practice, the minutes of this agenda item are not included in the circulated minutes but appear in the original minutes which are available for inspection by members of Senate.

**IV     MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

**1.     Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part A                     Page 18**

The Senate Committee on Awards met on August 27, 2009, to approve 4 new offers, 9 amended offers, and the withdrawal of 1 offer as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards.

**2.     Statement of Intent: Bachelor of Arts: Integrated Studies                     Page 24**

**3.     Update UM/ICM Academic Advisory Council                                     Page 28**

Dr. Lobdell spoke to this item indicating that the UM/ICM Academic Advisory Council meets frequently and prepares a report for the Principal of ICM and the Provost of the University of Manitoba at the end of each academic term. In addition, the Council is obliged to prepare an annual report for the President which is, in turn, circulated to Senate; this is the first annual report.

Dr. Lobdell noted the presence of a diverse group of students from 18 different countries. He indicated that there are 105 new students this year and that the number of students is growing rapidly and includes students from countries who would not normally attend the University. He further noted that the courses listed on Page 3 of the report (page 30 of the agenda) indicate UTP2 courses which are equivalent to first year university courses and UTP1 courses which are equivalent to Manitoba grade 12.

The GPAs of students in UTP2 courses was 2.61, very typical of first year students. The retention rate at ICM is about 90%. Of the 11 students eligible for admission to the University, all were offered admission, 9 accepted.

Mr. Tripple asked what was the average first year GPA of international students not enrolled in the International College of Manitoba. Dr. Lobdell responded that the Council is quite keen to establish comparable groups to evaluate this; however, currently the numbers are too small to be representative. This will be calculated as the numbers increase. He further noted that these types of comparisons are commonly done at other ICM-like institutions.

Mr. Tripple asked what is the average GPA of graduating ICM students. Dr. Lobdell referred to the Council report, page 31 of the agenda which indicated at range of 4.18 to 2.35. He further indicated the reluctance to publish the distribution of the GPAs due to the small number of students involved and privacy issues. The Principal of ICM, Ms. Susan Deane, was present at Senate and indicated that the average GPA was 3.39 but reaffirmed the small number of students and issues of privacy.

Mr. Tripple raised the question of the disparity between the number of UTP2 students enrolled in the first cohort and the number that transferred over into regular university studies. He asked if this was due to their grades being too low to be admitted, drop-outs, students taking part-time studies or some other reason? He further asked for the number of students in each of those categories. Dr. Lobdell responded that students who come

to ICM normally take longer than two terms to complete their studies which is typical of first year students generally. He noted that of the students who started in September of last year, 11 had completed by the end of May; those who came in January and May have obviously not had time to complete 30 credit hours. He went on to say that the number of students who started second year studies is small because they have had little time to complete. He observed that generally students regularly require at least 3 terms to complete 30 credit hours because often they are doing additional studies in English language use at the same time.

Mr. Tripple asked why is there a much smaller population in the UTP2 Arts program than any other program. Dr. Lobdell confirmed that the number in Arts was relatively small but reported that institutions like Simon Fraser University noted that students who had declared business early in their studies switched to Arts when they found out that Economics was contained there. He proposed that the numbers enrolled in Arts would likely change.

Mr. Tripple asked what the approximate amount of FTE positions were used in the U of M to fulfill the academic oversight functions for the International College of Manitoba. Dr. Lobdell indicated that this is always difficult to compute as it varies between departments and should be addressed to department heads; no complaints of overwork have been received by the Council, he noted, and indicated that it was the same amount of oversight as provided to summer session which is coordinated in Extended Education.

Mr. Tripple indicted that there was no information reported under items 6 and 7 in the ICM report and asked if there are no problems to be brought up could this be stated explicitly. Dr. Lobdell indicated that the ICM office and Council meet regularly and deal with issues as they arise. He confirmed that there had been no disciplinary issues. On the topic of diversity, Dr. Lobdell noted that the Council was surprised and pleased to see the diversity and especially seeing those students from parts of the world who would not normally come to the University of Manitoba.

Professor Anna indicated that, given the importance of this issue and the paperless nature of the agenda now he wished that this report had been distributed in paper form. He observed that the Senate Secretary might be left to the discretion of what should be sent to Senate in paper copy. The Chair and the Secretary agreed that the Secretary should take Professor Anna's comments under advisement.

Professor Young noted that the list of faculties to which students from ICM were admitted included faculties that have competitive admission standards and asked if the ICM students were admitted on a competitive basis. Dr. Lobdell confirmed that the students were admitted on a competitive basis in the same manner as any other applicants for admission.

Professor Morrill pointed out that one of the courses noted had a grade point average of 1.2. He asked if ICM was considering dropping any courses in light of this and also asked about VW rates of students from ICM. Dr. Lobdell said that students had struggles in the course in question, that ICM would not offer this course and, he believed that this course would no longer be offered to *any* first year students. On the second question,

Dr. Lobdell indicated that the continuation rate of ICM students was 92% and that it was the sense of the Council that the withdrawal rates were lower than the equivalent courses at the University.

Professor Alward asked what mechanisms are in place for ICM instructors to raise concerns about working conditions, what kind of protection do they have. Dr. Lobdell responded that there is weekly contact between the ICM office and instructors giving the instructors the ability to discuss issues directly and most, if not all, instructors with ICM are very experienced or very connected with departments which results in many instructors consulting not just with ICM but with colleagues within their department. In response, Professor Young observed that consultation is not the same as protection.

**V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

**Page 34**

The President reviewed that the planning framework document included the aspiration to be a great university and that there will be some challenges in light of these times of external financial pressures. He noted that the exact extent of this impact is, as yet, unknown but includes the impact on the pension plan of both investment returns and the change in mortality rates. Accordingly, budget challenges can be expected for the next number of years. As such, the University is looking at actions to look at efficiencies and costs.

Dr. Keselman spoke on the OARs project, Optimizing Academic Resources, indicating a twofold impetus in response to (1) the new planning framework with four explicit priorities, and (2) difficult budget challenges that are anticipated.

These items were the topic of a retreat held in early June with the Deans and Directors and other members of Executive Council on how to move ahead with academic aspirations in times of significant budget challenges. One of the major conclusions was that in order to move forward on the academic front, it is imperative to harness and utilize academic resources at full capacity. After this retreat, a network of undergraduate Associate Deans was created to discuss the undergraduate student experience, common issues, challenges and opportunities.

Dr. Keselman indicated that, if the University really wants to move forward on the academic front, it will need to take greater advantage of its collective academic expertise and mobilize academic resources in a more optimal way. She reported that the discussions at the Deans and Directors retreat and meeting with the Associate Deans revolved around three themes: (1) the need to find ways to collaborate and cooperate across faculties and schools more effectively in terms of the development of programs, the sharing of courses, joint appointments, and ways various areas can improve cooperation horizontally; (2) the development, over time, of a lot of rules, regulations, or "red tape" either at the faculty, department or institutional level have actually made it very difficult to use resources effectively and impacts the way that students can access resources across our faculties which results in a lot of barriers to mobility across the institution at the program level; (3) the University needs a Strategic Enrolment Management plan where we move from *recruiting by chance* to *recruiting by design* in a

focused way and move further to recruiting to retain, that is, what are we doing once the student is here to make sure their experience is successful.

Dr. Keselman noted that the purpose of the OARs project is to see if strategies can be identified by the University to reduce and remove barriers to the effective use of academic resources to allow forward movement on the academic front and the creation of efficiencies. The three areas of focus are: academic synergies and efficiencies; rules, regulations and “red tape”; and strategic enrolment management. The Deans and Directors Council will serve as the leadership committee for the project as it is important for all faculties and schools to be engaged in this process.

Three working committees will be established as follows:

1. Academic synergies and efficiencies chaired by Karen Grant, Vice-Provost (Academic Affairs) and Gary Glavin, Associate Vice-President (Research);
2. Rules, regulations and “red tape” chaired by Richard Lobdell, Vice-Provost (Programs); and
3. Strategic Enrolment Management chaired by Dave Morphy, Vice-Provost (Student Affairs) plus one of the Deans and Directors as this will include integrating our service activities with our academic activities.

These committees will be populated by Deans and Directors, Associate Deans Undergraduate and Research, and leaders within the University community.

Dr. Keselman indicated that more communiqués will be sent out by the end of October once the committees are set up. The work of these committees will be tied quite intimately with many committees of Senate and, before that, work at the faculty council level as many of the suggestions that come from the committees to optimize academic resources will have to be brought back to departments and faculty councils, and Senate committees such as SCCCC and the Senate Committee on Admissions who have the authority to change some of the things currently in place. Part of what the committees will be doing will be evaluating what is currently in place and presenting ways in which some of these issues can be addressed in an effective way and referring them back to appropriate committees of Senate or the department or faculty council for subsequent consideration.

Dr. Keselman reported that there is a website on the working committees and the project is looking for a broad base, looking for ideas and volunteers to take advantage of our collective expertise.

Mrs. McCallum then spoke about the ROSE – Resource Optimization and Service Enhancement – project which she co-chairs with Dr. Keselman. This project will look for opportunities over the next six months to reduce costs, improve services while minimizing the impact on staff. She noted that there was reference to ROSE in the President’s report. She noted that a request for proposals was sent out in August resulting in the submission of seven proposals for a consultant to assist with this project. She reported that a selection committee chose Pricewaterhousecoopers and that the project was launched this week. The core principles of this project are: to realize cost savings and efficiencies, to enhance quality and service, to be premised on fairness and

equity, to advance shared responsibility, and to promote accountability and transparency.

Mrs. McCallum indicated that the consultant, working with a steering committee, and another working group of university staff, have been asked to conduct a university wide review of the current administrative and academic support services those that are provided centrally as well as those that are provided within the units and the faculties. They have also been asked to recommend effective and efficient strategies to improve service and reduce the cost of providing these support functions and through such things as eliminating duplication, sharing resources, assessing the appropriateness of controls, leveraging technology, as so on. They will bring forward recommendations and an action plan and they will be doing some benchmarking throughout this project within the university sector and industry. A steering committee has been struck, Dr. Barnard is the executive sponsor of the project, the committee is co-chaired by Mrs. McCallum and Dr. Keselman.

Mrs. McCallum outlined the timeline for the project. Phase 1 is six weeks and will generate the deliverables previously mentioned. Phase 2 will be a longer term project. It is anticipated that quick wins will be generated in phase 1 and then a decision will be made which recommendations to carry forward into phase 2. Mrs. McCallum noted that 63 meetings had been held or scheduled this week between Pricewaterhousecoopers and members of the University community. Over the next six weeks Pricewaterhousecoopers will be blanketing the University interviewing as many people as they possibly can at all levels of the organization in order to collect as much data as possible. She added that, to minimize impact on current employees of what could be a possible reorganization, a vacancy management process is being implemented for support staff positions where unit heads are being asked not to fill support staff positions until there is a better understanding of the impact of this project on staff it is important to leave as many vacancies as possible so that we can reorganize and move people who might be affected by a reorganization.

Dr. McIlwraith raised the question of the impact of current circumstances on renewal for the university. He noted that with deferred retirements and hiring freezes will those who are working from one post-doc to the next or one sessional appointment to the next ever get a real academic job? He noted the big hole in many university departments from the last financial crisis and a lot of people who should be there as associate professors, aren't. He asked if there had been discussion on how to manage some reasonable renewal process at a time like this when we would be in danger of becoming a grey university and risking the loss of another generation of academics. Dr. Keselman responded that increasing efficiencies may mitigate some of these things as would creative responses rather than across the board cuts.

Professor Comack asked about the opportunities to give input into synergies and efficiencies and whether is there an opportunity for colleagues to respond in a meaningful way. Dr. Keselman responded that engagement and ideas were wanted and that the more people who could become involved, the better the outcome would be. Mrs. McCallum added that a website is in development which will have a suggestion box for comments from anyone on campus with the option of indicating if they wished to talk to



someone further. Dr. Keselman indicated that working groups will be formed quickly. Dr. Grant added that the Academic Synergies and Efficiencies group had met this morning and will be meeting on a biweekly basis with task groups meeting in between..

The Chair concluded that there would be many opportunities for response and engagement and encouraged people to share their input.

**VI QUESTION PERIOD**

No questions were received prior to 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

**VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2009**

Two corrections were made to the minutes, page 6, second paragraph, second line should read "*the reason was that because a number of specific questions*" and the fourth line should have a semi-colon added after "*particular ways*".

**Professor Gabbert MOVED, seconded by Professor Owens THAT: the minutes of the Senate meeting held on September 9, 2009 be approved as amended.**

**CARRIED**

**VIII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Professor Gabbert indicated business arising from the portion of the minutes regarding the report on Navitas after the President's trip to Australia. Professor Gabbert emphasized that this is not about the functioning of Navitas ~~which he did not feel relevant earlier in the agenda~~ and he did not feel that it was relevant to raise when the report was considered. Professor Gabbert spoke of 2007 when the Navitas/ICM issue arose that there were many Senators who were deeply concerned that the University had entered into an agreement relating to the University's academic programs without Senate's approval. Professor Gabbert expressed his opinion that this is an abuse of administrative power that showed contempt for Senate and collegial governance and it also violated the University of Manitoba Act. He felt that this remains true regardless of ICM's retention rate, its enrolment numbers, its royalty contributions, the number of its transfer students, the GPA of its students or whatever other performance indicator that one might deploy. He reported that these concerns were reiterated at the townhall meeting held by the President in April of this year. He noted that, at that meeting, questions and concerns arose about the by-passing of Senate approval and also about the lack of protections for faculty at ICM. In the course of the discussion, it appeared to Professor Gabbert that the President thought that it was regrettable that Senate approval had not been originally sought for the Navitas deal. The President was also pressed to raise the issue of protection for ICM faculty with Navitas management. He believed that it was fair to say that many who attended that meeting left thinking that the President would address these concerns. The President's report in the aftermath of his trip to Australia to consult with Navitas management says nothing about these matters. Longstanding concerns about the approval process and Senate's proper role in it are not

mentioned. Senate is promised the chance to discuss a review of ICM in five years and that, he noted, is a welcome development but he noted that in the report there is no clear commitment to get Senate approval for any continuation of the deal. Professor Gabbert asked if the President was committed to submitting the renewal of the ICM agreement to Senate for approval at the end of the five year period. The President responded that, yes it he was.

**IX      REPORTS OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
AND THE SENATE PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**

1.      **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 39
  
2.      **Report of the Senate  
Planning and Priorities Committee**

The President indicated that the Chair of this committee will report at the next meeting of Senate.

**X      REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES OF SENATE,  
FACULTY AND SCHOOL COUNCILS**

1.      **Report of the Senate Committee on Appeals**

Professor McNicol, Chair of the Committee, made the following report. The Committee has dealt with a number of appeals since the last report to Senate in March.

1.      Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Science to deny retroactive authorized withdrawals with the subsequent academic suspension. The grounds of the appeal were medical and procedural. The appeal was denied.
  
2.      Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny retroactive authorized withdrawals with the subsequent removal from the program. The grounds of the appeal were medical. The appeal was granted.
  
3.      Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Arts to not hear an appeal regarding the waiving of University requirements. The grounds of the appeal were medical. The appeal was granted.
  
4.      Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Science to deny retroactive authorized withdrawals from the 2007-08 academic year. The grounds of the appeal were medical. The appeal was denied.
  
5.      Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Medicine to not hear an appeal regarding the waiving of University requirements and subsequently recommend to Senate a Graduation Notwithstanding. The grounds of the appeal were medical. The appeal was denied.

6. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Medicine to deny retroactive removal of examination results from their academic record. The grounds of the appeal were medical. The appeal was granted.
7. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny a retroactive voluntary withdrawal from a course taken in Fall term 2008. The grounds of the appeal were undue hardship and procedural. The appeal was denied.

The committee also met and determined that there were no grounds for hearing two independent appeals by a student against two independent decisions by University 1, by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering or by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Science.

One appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Science and one appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Law were withdrawn by the appellants.

The committee has closed the file on a student who appealed against a decision by the Faculty of Nursing but who neither attended the hearing nor responded to a request for a reason.

The Committee currently has four open files.

Professor McNicol expressed his appreciation to the committee members and to Ms. Martin-Strong for their work on these matters.

**2. Report of the Senate Committee on University Research  
Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes  
RE: The Institute for the Humanities**

**Page 40**

In keeping with the policy on the periodic review of research centres and institutes, the Institute for the Humanities has been reviewed by the Senate Committee on University Research. The SCUR recommends that the Institute for the Humanities be renewed for a three year term.

Professor Owens expressed concern about the report's confusion about the way the Institute fosters the involvement of graduate students. She felt that the report seems to be critical of the Institute and perhaps reflect some misunderstanding of how researchers in the humanities learn to do what they do. In the humanities, she noted, researchers hone their skills by participating in the types of activities sponsored by the Institute that allow the opportunity to debate, discuss ideas, to formulate arguments and to familiarize with the state of scholarship in their fields of research, to theorize their own research interests and contribute to the formulation of research projects. According to a report of the Institute, she noted, during the past five years over 100 graduate students had been involved in UMHI events in various capacities. Professor Owens also questioned the lack of a sub-committee member from the humanities or social sciences.

Dr. Jayas reported that the sub-committee reviews the report and will ask for clarification. He emphasized that the sub-committee reviews on the basis of what is submitted by the Institute. He did indicate that the report recognizes both the lack of financial support for graduate students and the difficulty in obtaining outside funding in the humanities. There was an extensive discussion on the process of the review and the constraints placed when the information supplied by the institute being reviewed is not comprehensive.

Professor MacKendrick noted that this discipline often receives funding for research clusters which can bring in any number of international speakers which achieves attendance of university and community anywhere from small numbers to upwards of 100 people. This constitutes research where there are networks being built, publications written and the spiraling out of further activities

Professor Young indicated that she was a former director of the Institute and noted that there is a gap between the models used by Science and the Humanities. She noted that there is a large list of individual donors within the community and that this group needs to be respected and acknowledged. She further noted that the Institute has a large public face which disseminates knowledge and has a record of high production.

Dean Sigurdson viewed the recommendation as encouragement to seek more money and get more graduate students rather than as a criticism and noted that the research cluster is a more effective model of funding than funding individual researchers.

**Dr. Jayas MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on University Research regarding the Institute for the Humanities.**

**CARRIED**

**3. Report of the Senate Committee on the Calendar**

**Page 43**

Mr. Leclerc, Chair of the Committee, spoke to the report highlighting the series of recommendations to Senate. He noted that the Registrar's Office was in the process of acquiring a new software package to work with the Aurora system. He reported that the declining numbers of calendars printed and picked up by students have proven that the print calendar is not being used by students.

The second recommendation refers to what should be included in the calendar, something that had not previously been formally defined. The third recommendation, while non-binding, recommends an outside facilitator to work with units to provide some consistency across units; some of this may be addressed through OARs. Regarding quality concerns with the calendar, Mr. Leclerc reported that the Committee recommends that there should be a final sign off by the calendar editor and further indicated that the new package for calendar production currently being acquired by the Registrar's Office should provide additional checks and balances the calendar material.

Mr. Leclerc indicated that a new web based version of the calendar would provide links to other sites for information rather than containing all the information currently in the

print calendar. As such, the Committee encourages departments to ensure that their websites are current.

**Dean Doering MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on the Calendar [dated August 27, 2009].**

Dean Sigurdson endorsed the online version but asked for clarification on what should not be included in the calendar. Mr. Marnoch confirmed that once approved, calendar content providers would be given directives on these matters over the next few weeks.

Professor Hansen requested that it be ensured that the online version was be accessible to the visually impaired.

Dean Sigurdson expressed the opinion that the final three recommendations of the report were not within the mandate of Senate.

**Dean Whitmore MOVED, seconded by Dean Sigurdson THAT: Senate approve the following recommendations from the Report of the Senate Committee on the Calendar [dated August 27, 2009]:**

**THAT Senate designate that the official General Academic Calendar be the online version commencing 2011-2012 academic session. This electronic Calendar should take advantage of the multiple structural and interactive tools available and should be designed from the ground up. The 2010-2011 web calendar will be a searchable pdf while the new interactive calendar is in development for 2011-2012 release. The 2011-2012 will be the final print calendar.**

**THAT the content of the Calendar should include detailed information on:**

- **program requirements**
- **specific admission requirements**
- **progression and graduation requirements**
- **the Academic Schedule**
- **general academic rules and regulations.**

**A summary of University services (Student Advocacy, Counseling and Career Services, Financial Aid and Awards, Housing, etc.) and policies and regulations should be included with links to detailed information.**

**CARRIED**

- |           |   |                |
|-----------|---|----------------|
| <b>4.</b> | <b><u>Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B</u></b> | <b>Page 46</b> |
|           | <b>a) <u>Appendix A: Award Amendments</u></b>                   | <b>Page 47</b> |

At its meeting of August 27, 2009, the committee reviewed two amended offers that appear to be discriminatory according to the Policy for Non-Acceptance of Discriminatory Scholarships, Bursaries or Fellowships. The Committee received letters of support for the Elizabeth Luginbuhl Award from Dr. Bate, Head of the Department of Computer

Science; and for the Dr. Margaret Marchand Scholarship from Dean Whitmore, Faculty of Science. Professor Hultin noted that the latter award was originally a fellowship for women in the Faculty of Science, no longer an underrepresented group. The amendment is to target a subset of science, namely numerical sciences, where women are still underrepresented.

**Professor Hultin MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B Appendix A [dated August 27, 2009] regarding the Elizabeth Luginbuhl Award and the Dr. Margaret Marchand Scholarship.**

**CARRIED**

**b) Appendix B: revisions to Policy on Non-Acceptance of discriminatory Scholarships, Bursaries or Fellowships** Page 53

The committee also considered modifications to the Policy on Non-Acceptance of discriminatory Awards. Professor Hultin indicated that these were housekeeping issues which replaced “Scholarships, Bursaries or Fellowships” in the title with “Awards” and changing the language to explicitly quote section 9(2) of the Manitoba Human Rights Code rather than listing specific characteristics.

**Professor Hultin MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B Appendix B [dated August 27, 2009] regarding the revisions to the Policy on Non-Acceptance of Discriminatory Awards.**

**CARRIED**

**5. Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations**

The Chair noted that this report was distributed at the meeting. Professor Etcheverry indicated that the committee met in September and now puts forward this list of nominees. She further noted that a student subcommittee had been delegated to provide a list of student nominees which was also included in the report.

**Professor Etcheverry MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated October 7, 2009].**

**CARRIED**

**6. Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees  
RE: Policy and Procedures on the Naming of Buildings,  
Parts of Building and Spaces Page 59**

Dr. Keselman took the chair and invited Dr. Barnard, vice-chair of the committee to speak to the report. Dr. Barnard indicated that this constituted a separation into policy and procedure documents, clarified a number of items and made more explicit some other items as outlined in the report.

**Dr. Barnard MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees [dated September 21, 2009] regarding the Policy and Procedures on the Naming of Buildings, Parts of Building and Spaces.**

**CARRIED**

Dr. Barnard resumed the chair.

**XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

**1. Emergency Approval Authority**

**Page 66**

The Chair noted that all units within the university have been involved in creating pandemic plans. Through this process, he noted that it became evident that, should a situation arise with this pandemic which prevented Senate from meeting, there was no process in place to approve essential academic matters.

It is proposed that, in such a situation, that Senate Executive be delegated to make decisions on behalf of Senate during a pandemic health emergency declared by external health authorities. The Chair noted that Senate Executive had an extensive discussion on the advisability of such delegation and the committee felt strongly that the authority should be limited in time, with triggers to initiate and a comprehensive list of matters which can be considered in this manner.

**Professor Brabston MOVED on behalf of Senate Executive THAT:**

**If in the event of a pandemic health emergency, as declared by the appropriate department of the Government of Manitoba (e.g., Department of Health or Emergency Management Organization), the Government of Manitoba requires a curtailment of normal university activities and operations during the 2009-2010 academic year, Senate authorizes the Senate Executive Committee to act for Senate in determining academic matters which require urgent resolution. These matters are limited to:**

- a) Revisions to the academic schedule;**
- b) Modifications to examination regulations;**
- c) Approving academic accommodations for students affected by the pandemic health emergency;**
- d) Approving candidates for degrees, diplomas, certificates, prizes and awards;**

**This authority shall be limited to the period of emergency as declared by the Government of Manitoba – normal approval channels shall be restored as soon as it is permissible and safe to do so. The Senate Executive Committee shall report any actions taken to Senate both by email and at the subsequent meeting of Senate following a pandemic health emergency situation.**

**CARRIED**

**2. Policy and Procedure: Research Centres,  
Institutes and Groups**

**Page 68**

Dr. Jayas reported that minor changes were contained in the policy and procedures including section 2.2.3 which dealt with funding issues.

Professor Hultin, refereeing to 2.1.2 asked if 'research group' is a restricted term that required approval by the Board of Governors as this term is used in most lab sciences referring to the operation of a laboratory. Dr. Jayas confirmed that there is no change in policy regarding this.

**Dr. Jayas MOVED, seconded by Professor McMillan THAT: Senate approve the revised Policy and Procedures for Research Centres, Institutes and Groups [September 10, 2009].**

**CARRIED**

**XI ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 16 combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 78 distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on October 7, 2009.

/mb